

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Attached hereto is a duplicate copy of the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed with the application also to include at least English Abstracts of the cited references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider these references and provide an indication thereof with the next Patent Office communication.

Without conceding the propriety of the outstanding rejections, the independent claims have been amended to provide explicit antecedent basis and to specifically point out that the storage means is distinct from the processing means.

Amended Claim 20 specifically states selecting a piece of sensitive information stored in the storage means, determining a specific condition for the integrity of said selected information, reading said information and transmitting it to the processing means for processing, processing said information and verifying during processing that the specific condition is satisfied and disabling processing of said information if the specific condition is not satisfied.

This combination of features is not taught or suggested by the cited reference. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in Holtey of the broader concept of protecting the processing of sensitive information in a security module.

Similarly, regarding Claim 29, the cited references fail to teach or suggest information storage means distinct from the processing means including means for selecting in said storage means information to be processed, and means for extracting selected information from the storage means, said extracting means transmitting said selected information to processing means, and means for verifying a specific integrity condition of a piece of sensitive information in conjunction with means for disabling the processing of the information, said means for disabling being activated when the means for verification have

detected that the specific condition is not satisfied. .

Again, Applicant firmly asserts that there is simply no teaching or suggestion of this combination of features in the cited references.

The outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are also untenable in that the references fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims and the motivation provided to combine the references does not satisfy well established legal criteria in that the proposed modification would change the principle of operation of the relied-upon reference. This is even more evident given the extremely specific and complex structure of Holtey. Moreover, the fact that the claimed invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient to itself establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Based at least on these deficiencies, Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the operation of the claimed invention on the distinctions between the claims and the cited references the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to schedule a personal interview.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JHV:jab

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
(703) 903-9000

By:



Edward J. Kondracki  
Reg. No. 20,604

Jason H. Vick  
Reg. No. 45,285

December 15, 2004